UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

    Plaintiff,

        v.

OKLAHOMA GAS & ELECTRIC CO.,

    Defendant.

Civil Action No. 5:13-cv-00690-D

PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES' OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDEMENT AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

EXHIBIT 8

Mayberry, Edward

From:	Kuennen, Larry
Sent:	Thursday, July 29, 2004 2:22 PM
To:	SOONER PP USERS; MUSKOGEE PP USERS; Mayberry, Edward; Nunez, David; Bohn Jr, George
Cc:	Leach, Thomas; Madron, Ronald; Turner Jr, Frederick; Pearson, James; Johnson, Ken; Hanan, Kami; Tymchuk, Randy; Gladhill, Zachary; Morphis, Kim; Clear, Gary
Subject:	SO 1 and SO 2 Boiler Test Results- 2004

saved attachment to H://PS_PSS/Shared/Boiler Test Reports/Boiler Tests-Coal Units-SO 1&2.doc

Attached is the summary for the Sooner boiler tests.

I sent the MK 5 test results to Sooner PP personnel and I'm now sending the SO results to MKPP personnel. Why? Basically, we're all in this together. All the coal units will eventually have the new economizers, HP/IPs and steam surface upgrades. What's changed this year is the environmental CAP that each unit will have for five years after the first upgrade is installed (clock starts the year following the first installed upgrade). You may have noticed on SCADA that MK 4 "appears" to always be down in load. Why? It's normally not any mechanical or operational issues; we're trying to ensure the unit can operate the entire year. Next year SO 2, MK 5 and MK 6 will be operated with the same environmental constraints. SO 1 will not have a limitation. Expect SO 1 to be the first coal unit to be loaded up and that last unit to be dropped in load.

As you can see, it's no longer a Muskogee or Sooner "thing" or that one plant is being favored over the other on loading or load control operation. We're just trying to maximize the output of our coal units without exceeding the environmental CAPS.

LK

1